

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 6 have been amended, claim 9 has been canceled without prejudice, and new claim 11 has been added. Claims 1-3, 6-7 and 10-11 are presently pending.

In view of such amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration and allowance of the claims, as presently presented, are respectfully requested.

EXAMINER'S ACTION

The 35 U.S.C. § 112 Rejections

Claims 1-3, 6-7 and 9-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for indefiniteness.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite the claimed invention as a process "consisting essentially of the steps of" Consequently, the Examiner's rejection for indefiniteness based on use of the "consisting of" wording has been mooted. In addition, claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the support foil imparts corresponding holographic structures to at least the first layer of the sheet.

Further, claim 6 has been amended to overcome the rejection for lack of antecedent basis for the term "the coating film." Claim 6, as amended, depends from claim 1 and recites that the sheet has a claimed thickness.

Claim 9 has been canceled and replaced by new dependent claim 11, which depends from claim 1. Claim 11 clarifies the relationship between the step of providing a sheet having at least first and second layers and the step of curing the layers by reciting that the second layer of the sheet is provided only after the first layer of the sheet is subjected to curing.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted the Examiner withdraw the Section 112 rejections of the claims.

The 35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

Claims 1-3, 6-7 and 9-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(b) as being obvious over McGrew. Amended claim 1, dependent claims 2-3, 6-7 and 10, and new dependent claim 11 (which replaces canceled claim 9) clearly are patentable over McGrew.

Claim 1, as amended, is directed to a process for producing a sheet bearing a hologram where the process consists essentially of certain steps that must be performed in order. The steps, in relevant part, include providing a sheet comprising at least a first layer and a second layer directly on one side of the embossed support foil for imparting corresponding holographic structures to at least the first layer of the sheet, curing the layers, and then removing the sheet from the foil. Claim 1 further requires that the first and second layers are different in color and include a crosslinked material.

Although McGrew teaches coating a single resin layer onto the relief surface of a master (see Col. 3, lines 37-62), there is no teaching or suggestion of a process consisting essentially of certain steps to be performed in order as set forth in claim 1. Nowhere does McGrew teach providing the sheet with at least first and second layers on one side of the embossed support foil, where the first and second layers are different in color and include crosslinked material. The use of different color layers on one side of the sheet advantageously provides that a high contrast effect can be achieved by, for example, marking one of the layers using a controllable outlet laser. (See specification at page 5, lines 16-26 and 35-38). It is respectfully submitted that one of skill in the art

would not have been motivated based on McGrew to provide for a process for producing a hologram which consists essentially of certain steps to be performed in order, as set forth in claim 1.

Accordingly, claim 1 is patentable over McGrew.

Further, claims 2-3, 6-7 and 10-11 which depend directly from claim 1, are also patentable over McGrew for the same reasons as set forth above with respect to claim 1 and because of the further restrictions they add.

Therefore, withdrawal of the Section 103 rejections is, therefore, respectfully requested.


CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, it is believed that all of the claims, as presently presented, are patentable.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned if it is believed that further amendment and/or discussion would help to advance the prosecution of the present application.

Reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-3, 6-7 and 10-11 are, therefore, respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Davy E. Zoneraich
Registration Number 37,267

NORRIS, McLAUGHLIN & MARCUS
P.O. Box 1018
Somerville, New Jersey 08876-1018
Phone: (908) 722-0700
Fax: (908) 722-0755
E-Mail: ipdept@nmmlaw.com
Attorney Docket No: 101769-056US